

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated December 5, 2003, the Examiner rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Claims 1, 13, and 16 have been amended to clarify that the cover has a shape substantially the same as the transformer. No new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully traverses the claim rejections and requests reconsideration.

A. Response to the Kaiser 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) Rejections

Claims 1, 2, 4, and 7-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,936,842 ("Kaiser"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

In amended claims 1, 13, and 16, Applicant recites an electrical assembly having a transformer and a cover for the transformer. The cover is a translucent electrically insulating cover having a shape substantially the same as the transformer. This cover effectively transmits heat generated by the transformer outwardly. (See, e.g., Applicant's Specification, page 8, lines 14-17.) As a result, problems caused by heat generated by a transformer (e.g., damage to the transformer and electrical losses) may be reduced.

In contrast, Kaiser describes a housing for an electric-drive unit. (See, e.g., Kaiser, Title.) The housing includes a translucent cover in a section of the housing in an area near a lighting device located within the housing. (See, e.g., Kaiser, column 2, lines 6-14.) This translucent cover allows the lighting device to transmit light. However, this translucent cover is not in an area containing the transformer located within the housing. Further, the translucent cover does not have a shape substantially the same as the transformer. Kaiser does not suggest that the translucent cover would have a shape substantially the same as the transformer because the purpose of the cover is different. Kaiser's translucent cover is used to transmit light from a light device, not to transmit heat

generated by a transformer. Because Kaiser does not show or suggest a translucent cover having a shape substantially the same as the transformer, Kaiser does not show or suggest each and every element of claims 1, 13, and 16. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Kaiser does not anticipate claims 1, 13, and 16.

Claims 2, 4, and 7-12 depend from claim 1. Claims 14 and 15 depend from claim 13. Claim 17 depends from claim 16. Accordingly, Applicant also submits that Kaiser does not anticipate claims 2, 4, 7-12, 14, 15, and 17 for at least the reasons set forth above.

B. Response to the Noone 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) Rejections

Claims 1-10 and 13-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,791,290 ("Noone"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Noone describes a photo-electric control unit for street lighting. (See, e.g., Noone, Abstract.) The photo-electric control unit is located below a translucent conical cover. (See, e.g., Noone, column 5, lines 10-19.) This translucent conical cover allows light to pass through to a photoelectric sensor located on a printed circuit card. The shape of the cover is designed to prevent accumulation of dirt and to discourage birds from perching on the cover.

A transformer is also located on the printed circuit board. (See, e.g., column 6, lines 40-43.) However, the translucent conical cover does not have a shape substantially the same as the transformer. Noone does not suggest that the translucent cover would have a shape substantially the same as the transformer because the shape of the cover is designed to prevent accumulation of dirt and to discourage birds from perching on the cover, not to transmit heat generated by a transformer. Because Noone does not show or suggest a translucent cover having a shape substantially the same as the transformer, Noone does not show or suggest each and every element

of claims 1, 13, and 16. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Noone does not anticipate claims 1, 13, and 16.

Claims 2-10 depend from claim 1. Claims 14 and 15 depend from claim 13. Claims 17-20 depend from claim 16. Accordingly, Applicant also submits that Kaiser does not anticipate claims 2-10, 14, 15, and 17-20 for at least the reasons set forth above.


In light of the above, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

CONCLUSION

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance and respectfully request notice to this effect. The Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's representative below if any questions arise or she may be of assistance to the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 5, 2004



Lisa M. Schoedel
Reg. No. 53,564
McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert & Berghoff LLP
300 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6709
312 935 2362
schoedel@mbhb.com